

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 3-7 and 11-15 are amended, claims 1, 2 and 8-10 and 16 are cancelled (without prejudice or disclaimer), and claims 17-30 are added herein.

As amended herein, claims 17, 18, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 are independent.

It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

Figure 13 is objected to on informality grounds. Figure 13 is amended along the lines suggested by the Examiner to address the noted concern. More particularly, Figure 13 is amended for consistency with the description on page 37 line 5 of the specification. Accordingly, Step S52 in Fig. 13 (which originally read “Receive BET reception ending notification information”) is amended to read “Receive BET acceptance end notification information”.

The specification is objected to on informality grounds. The specification is amended along the lines suggested by the Examiner to address the noted concern.

Claim 1 is objected to on informality grounds. Claim 1 is cancelled herein, and according the objection is now moot.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Cannon (US 2002/0183105). The rejections relating to claims 1, 2 and 8-10 and 16 are moot in view of the cancellation of these claims herein.

New claim 17 includes limitations previously recited in claims 1, 2 and 8 (now cancelled). Similarly, new claim 18 includes limitations previously recited in claims 9, 10 and 16 (now also cancelled). New independent claims 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 recite the invention in a different manner.

Claim 17 requires that the second controller of the second gaming machine be configured with logic to “control a period of time for accepting bets on the second game”, “transmit bet period data”, and “determine a payout for the second game in accordance with the transmitted first bet data [from the first gaming machine] and second bet data indicative of a second bet on the second

game having been placed at the second gaming machine within the period of time, if the second controller receives the transmitted first bet data within the period of time.

In addition, claim 17 requires that the first controller of the first gaming machine be configured with logic to “independently control a first game played by a first player at the first gaming machine”, “control display of images of the second game in accordance with the transmitted image data [from the second gaming machine]”, and “control display of an indication of a start of the period of time for accepting the bets on the second game in accordance with the transmitted bet period data [from the second gaming machine]”.

In the gaming system of claim 17, the second controller controls the play of the second game on multiple gaming machines by individual players at the respective gaming machines, including a gaming machine with a first controller for independently controlling a different first game played by a first player at the first gaming machine. As an aspect of the invention, the second controller controls the period of time for accepting a bet on the second game interactively with the first controller. The interactive operation between the first and second controllers is supported, for example, by the descriptions on page 39, line 25 to page 40, line 14 of the specification.

In contrast, Cannon does not teach or suggest these limitations of claim 17. More particularly, while Cannon does disclose a multiplayer configuration and tournament play, Cannon explicitly discloses that software for controlling every game played on an individual gaming machine is either already stored on that gaming machine or downloaded to that gaming machine. Hence, according to Cannon, the controller of each individual gaming machine controls the play of every game played on that gaming machine (see pages 8-9 paragraphs 73-74).

This is further confirmed by Cannon's required extracting of game images from each gaming machine by the server, which would be unnecessary if there was central control of a game (see, for example pages 9-10, paragraph 81). Even for remote user control, Cannon discloses that the server simply supports operations “that relate to the function of the gaming machine 70” (see page 11,

paragraph 95, emphasis added). See also page 17, paragraphs 145-146.

Furthermore, Cannon lacks any disclosure of the controller of one gaming machine being capable of controlling the period of time for accepting a bet on the a game interactively with the controller of another gaming machine.

While it is acknowledged that, in Examiner referenced paragraphs 65, 68, 72 and 83, Cannon discloses that the server may alert a player via a pop-up window on gaming machine display of “an impending gaming tournament or other special event”, or poll the player regarding his/her interest in participating in such an event, it is respectfully submitted that nowhere does Cannon teach or suggest that one gaming machine controls the period of time for accepting a bet placed at another gaming machine.

Additionally, claim 17 requires that the first controller be configured with logic to “transmit first bet data indicative of a first bet on the second game having been placed at the first gaming machine” and that the second controller be further configured with logic to “determine a payout for the second game in accordance with the transmitted first bet data and second bet data indicative of a second bet on the second game having been placed at the second gaming machine within the period of time, if the second controller receives the transmitted first bet data within the period of time”.

It is respectfully submitted that Cannon lacks any teaching or suggestion that a payout for a game is determined at one gaming machine in accordance with the bet data received from another gaming machine, if that bet data has been received within a time period controlled by the one gaming machine.

Claim 18 requires that the first controller of the first gaming machine be configured with logic to “independently control a first game played by the first player”, “receive image data associated with play of the second game from the second gaming machine [having a second controller configured with logic to control a second game played by a plurality of players at a plurality of gaming machines, including a first player at the first gaming machine and a second player at the second game machine]”, and “direct display of images of the second game in accordance with the received image data”.

As has been discussed above, Cannon lacks any disclosure of one gaming machine controller having logic to control the play of a game on multiple gaming machines by individual players at the respective gaming machines, including a gaming machine with a controller for independently controlling a different game played by a player at that gaming machine.

Claim 18 also requires that the first controller of the first gaming machine be configured with logic to “receive, from the second gaming machine, bet time information indicative of initiation of acceptance of bets on the second game”, and “direct display of a bet time for the second game in accordance with the received bet time information”.

As has been discussed above, Cannon lacks any disclosure that one gaming machine controls the period of time for accepting a bet placed at another gaming machine. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Cannon fails to teach or suggest the first controller recited in claim 18.

Claim 26 requires a second controller configured with logic to “control a second game played by a plurality of players at a plurality of gaming machines, including the first player at the first gaming machine [having a first controller configured with logic to independently control play of a first game by a first player], and a second player at the second game machine”, “control a period of time for accepting a bet on the second game”, “transmit an indication of a start of the controlled time period to the first gaming machine”, “receive first bet data indicative of a first bet on the second game having been placed at the first gaming machine”, and “determine a payout for the second game in accordance with the received first bet data and second bet data indicative of a second bet on the second game having been placed at the second gaming machine, if the first bet data has been received within the controlled time period”.

It is respectfully submitted that, for reasons that are believed to be clear from the discussion above, Cannon fails to teach or suggest the second controller recited in claim 26.

Claim 27 requires a first controller configured with logic to “independently control play of a first game by the first player”, “receive image data for the second

game from the second gaming machine [having a second controller configured with logic to control a second game played by a plurality of players at a plurality of gaming machines, including the first player at the first gaming machine], and “control the displaying of the second game by the display device in accordance with the received image data”.

As discussed above, Cannon lacks any teaching or suggestion of a controller of a gaming machine which is capable of independently controlling the play of one game by a player on that gaming machine and displaying images of a second game playable by that player and controlled by a controller of another gaming machine in accordance with image data received from that other gaming machine.

Claim 28 requires a second controller configured with logic to “control a second game played by a plurality of players at a plurality of gaming machines, including the first player at the first gaming machine [having a first controller configured with logic to independently control play of a first game by the first player]”, and “direct transmission of image data of the controlled second game to the first gaming machine”

As discussed above, Cannon lacks any teaching or suggestion of a controller of a gaming machine which is capable of controlling one game played by a first player at another gaming machine, where the other gaming machine also has a controller capable of independently controlling play of a different game by the first player.

Claim 29 requires “a first gaming machine having a first controller configured with logic to independently control play of a first game at the first gaming machine by a first player”, and “a second gaming machine ...having a second controller configured with logic to (i) control a second game played by a plurality of players at a plurality of gaming machines, including the first player at the first gaming machine, (ii) transmit image data of the second game to the first gaming machine” with the first controller further configured with logic to “control the displaying of the second game on the display device in accordance with the transmitted image data”.

As discussed above, Cannon lacks any teaching or suggestion of a controller of a gaming machine which is capable of controlling one game played by a player at another gaming machine, where that other gaming machine also has a controller capable of independently controlling play of a different game by that first player.

Claim 30 requires "a first gaming machine configured with logic to control play of a first type game by the first player on the first gaming machine", and "a second gaming machine configured with logic to simultaneously control play of a second type game, different than the first type game, by the first player on the first gaming machine and by a second player on the second gaming machine".

It is respectfully submitted that, as has been discussed above, Cannon lacks any teaching or suggestion of first and second gaming machines having the above features.

Other features recited in the dependent claims also further distinguishes over the applied prior art. Such feature include, for example, second game display device that includes a BET detector for detecting the placing of the first bet on the second game at the first gaming machine or by the first player, as required by claims 22 and 25.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed local telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any remaining issues and further to expedite passage of the application to issue, if any further comments, questions or suggestions arise in connection with the application.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case No.1227.43716X00) and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

/Alfred A. Stadnicki/

Alfred A. Stadnicki
Registration No. 30,226

1300 North Seventeenth Street
Suite 1800
Arlington, VA 22209
Tel.: 703-312-6600
Fax.: 703-312-6666
AAS/kbl

14 / 32

Fig. 13

